

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Gerald D. Freeman, ) Civil Action No.: 6:08-3686-GRA-BHH  
                          )  
                          Plaintiff, )  
                          )  
                         vs. ) **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**  
                          )  
                          ) **OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE**  
Robins & Morton, )  
                          )  
                         Defendant. )

The plaintiff is proceeding in this action *pro se*. On May 14, 2009, the defendant filed a motion to dismiss. On May 15, 2009, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the plaintiff was advised of the summary dismissal procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. Despite this explanation, the plaintiff elected not to respond to the motion.

As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court filed a second order on June 23, 2009, giving the plaintiff through July 16, 2009, to file his response to the motion to dismiss. The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, this action would be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The plaintiff elected not to respond.

Based on the foregoing, it appears the plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed *with prejudice* for lack of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir.1982). See *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989). *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990).

July 21, 2009  
Greenville, South Carolina

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BRUCE H. HENDRICKS  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE